UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,554 04/14/2006		Jean-Bernard Fischer	0579-1112	1488
466 YOUNG & TH	7590 04/30/201 <sup>1</sup> OMPSON	EXAMINER		
209 Madison St Suite 500		GELAGAY, SHEWAYE		
Alexandria, VA	. 22314	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2437	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/30/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DocketingDept@young-thompson.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/563,554	FISCHER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
	Ait Oille		

	SHEWAYE GELAGAY	2437					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ess				
THE REPLY FILED 09 April 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	date of the final rejectio	n. .ED WITHIN TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra transfer of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	but prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	201100				
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);					
appeal; and/or	,, ,	3 1 7 3					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	·						
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allength non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	t canceling the				
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	planation of				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fails e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after en	try is below or attache	ed.				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:				
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Emmanuel L. Moise/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437							
ouporvisory i atont Examinor, Art Offit 2437							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument filed on 04/09/10 have been fully considred but they are not persuasive. The Applicant argued that Stahl teaches away from combination with other reference where the anomaly function is executed if the predetermined (previously stacked) value is unstacked. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Stahl teaches a method for ensuring the integrity of the stack during program execution including comparing the signautre word stored on the stack with the subroutine entry address code; passing control to the return address if the compared values are equal; and executing a software iterrupt if the compared values are not equal. Stahl explicitly teaches that if the compared value are not equal executing a software interrupt. However, Stahl does not teach the predetermined value is an address of being an address of anomaly processing function and removing said predetermined value from the instruction stack without executing processing function. Choi teaches protecting systems against stack attacks by inserting a canary word to the stack just before, the return address when a function has been called, and when the function returns, StackGuard checks the canary word. If the canaray word has not been changed, then the function progresses normally. Applicant's argument that Stahl teaches away is not persuasive Stahl and Choi as well as Applicant's invention relates to keeping the integrity of execution of a software specifically by keeping the the integrity of the stack. Therfore, they are related to the same problem being solved secure execution of a program. As discussed above, Stahl teaches ensuring integrity of stack during program execution by comparing the signature word stored on the satck and executing a software interrupt if the comapred values are not equal and therefore does not teach away from the other reference Choi teaches protecting the stack against attacks by checking a canary word and progressing with normal exeuction if the canary work has not been changed.

2